

**MISSOURI STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE
FISCAL NOTE (08-26)**

Subject

Initiative petition from Jonathan Bunch regarding a proposed amendment to Article V of the Missouri Constitution. (Received March 10, 2008)

Date

March 27, 2008

Description

This proposal would amend Article V, Section 25 of the Missouri Constitution.

The proposal is to be voted on in November, 2008.

Public comments and other input

The State Auditor's Office requested input from the **Attorney General's Office**, the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Economic Development**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the **Department of Higher Education**, the **Department of Health and Senior Services**, the **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration**, the **Department of Mental Health**, the **Department of Natural Resources**, the **Department of Corrections**, the **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations**, the **Department of Revenue**, the **Department of Public Safety**, the **Department of Social Services**, the **Governor's Office/Office of Administration**, the **Missouri House of Representatives**, the **Department of Conservation**, the **Office of State Courts Administrator**, the **Department of Transportation**, the **Missouri Senate**, the **Secretary of State's Office**, the **Office of the State Public Defender**, the **State Treasurer's Office**, **Boone County**, **Callaway County**, **Clay County**, **Cole County**, **Greene County**, **Jackson County**, **Jasper County**, **St. Charles County**, **St. Louis County**, the **City of Columbia**, the **City of Jefferson**, the **City of Kansas City**, the **City of St. Joseph**, the **City of St. Louis**, **Cape Girardeau 63 School District**, **Hannibal 60 School District**, **Rockwood R-VI School District**, **Linn State Technical College**, **Metropolitan Community College**, the **University of Missouri**, **St. Louis Community College**.

Assumptions

Officials from the **Attorney General's Office** indicated that implementation of this proposal will create no fiscal impact for their office.

Officials from the **Department of Economic Development** assume no fiscal or administrative impact from the proposal.

Officials from the **Department of Higher Education** indicated no foreseeable direct impact on their department.

The **Department of Health and Senior Services** indicated no impact as a result of this initiative petition.

The **Department of Insurance, Financial Institutions and Professional Registration** indicated this proposal will have no cost to the department.

The **Department of Mental Health** stated the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their department.

The **Department of Corrections** indicated no impact on their agency.

The **Department of Labor and Industrial Relations** stated the proposal does not have a fiscal impact on their department.

The **Department of Revenue** indicated the proposal will have no impact on their department.

The **Department of Public Safety** indicated there is no fiscal impact for the director's office.

The **Department of Social Services** indicated there is no fiscal impact on their department.

Officials from the **Governor's Office/Office of Administration** indicated passage of this proposal should not result in additional costs or savings to the Governor's Office. They stated that there could be an impact to the Office of Administration related to the requirement of the Commissioner to approve payment of expenses. However, they expect this amount to be minimal and absorbed within current appropriation levels for the Commissioner's Office.

The **Department of Conservation** indicated no fiscal impact is expected to their agency as a result of this proposal.

The **Office of State Courts Administrator** indicated this proposal should not have a fiscal impact on the judiciary.

The **Missouri Senate** indicated there appears to be no fiscal impact on their agency as a result of the proposal.

Officials from the **Secretary of State's Office** indicated their office is required to pay for publishing in local newspapers the full text of each statewide ballot measure as directed by Article XII, Section 2(b) of the Missouri Constitution and Section 116.230-116.290, RSMo. The Secretary of State's office is provided with core funding to handle a certain amount of normal activity resulting from each year's legislative session. Funding for this item is adjusted each year depending upon the election cycle with \$1.6 million historically appropriated in even numbered fiscal years and \$100,000 appropriated in odd numbered fiscal years to meet these requirements. The appropriation has historically been an estimated appropriation because the final cost is dependent upon the number of ballot measures approved by the General Assembly and the initiative petitions certified for the ballot. In FY 2007, at the August and November elections, there were 6 statewide Constitutional Amendments or ballot propositions that cost \$1.2 million to publish (an average of \$193,000 per issue). Therefore, the Secretary of State's office assumes, for the purposes of this fiscal note, that it should have the full appropriation authority it needs to meet the publishing requirements.

Officials from the **Office of the State Public Defender** indicated this proposal will have no significant impact on their office.

The **State Treasurer's Office** indicated the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their office.

Officials from **Jasper County** indicated that the enactment of this proposal would render no material cost to their county.

Officials from the **City of Columbia** indicated that no fiscal impact is expected from this proposal.

Officials from the **City of Jefferson** do not anticipate any fiscal impact should this petition become law.

Officials from the **Hannibal 60 School District** indicated this proposal would have no effect or cost or savings to their district.

Officials from **Linn State Technical College** indicated there appears to be no fiscal impact to their organization as a result of this proposal.

Officials from **Metropolitan Community College** indicated this petition would have no fiscal impact on their organization.

The State Auditor's Office did not receive a response from the **Department of Agriculture**, the **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education**, the

Department of Natural Resources, the Missouri House of Representatives, the Department of Transportation, Boone County, Callaway County, Clay County, Cole County, Greene County, Jackson County, St. Charles County, St. Louis County, the City of Kansas City, the City of St. Joseph, the City of St. Louis, Cape Girardeau 653 School District, Rockwood R-VI School District, the University of Missouri, St. Louis Community College.

Fiscal Note Summary

It is estimated this proposal will have no costs or savings to state or local governmental entities.